HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XV, No. 32 Monday, August 11, 1958 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

ROCKEFELLER: *Aiming for 1960?*.....(page 1)

SPENDING: *New housing scandals*.....(page 4)

Recession recedes, inflation swells.....(page 1)

STASSEN: *Still leads surrenderbund*.....(page 2)

RIGHT TO WORK: *Showdown looms*.....(page 3)

The New Rockefeller Monopoly: As some observers in the Capital view it, Nelson Rockefeller's bid for the GOP gubernatorial nomination in New York lays the groundwork for a "liberal" monopoly in the 1960 Presidential scrap. Rockefeller may well take the GOP Governorship nomination two weeks hence, unless the convention delegates perceive the rather sinister long-range plan which seems to guide the current maneuvers of the GOP left wing.

Washington speculation goes like this: Rockefeller got out of the Eisenhower Administration over a year ago (after a long New Dealish career in this Administration and in the preceding administrations of Roosevelt and Truman). By leaving Ike's regime, Nelson removed himself from public association with the liabilities attached thereto (now many), that might prove harmful to a candidate in New York state. Some clever planning obviously backed up this move.

Rockefeller has said nothing recently to queer his pitch, and meanwhile work has gone on to range behind him strong forces for his nomination and election in November. The campaign funds are already "made" with the plenteous Rockefeller millions. Rockefeller religious philanthropies should net him the up-state Protestant vote. His publicity mentor, Anna Rosenberg, can be counted on to line up a decisive portion of the Jewish vote (Senator Javits is also working on this). Mrs. Rosenberg (whose strongest political kinship is with the far left-wing *New York Post*) can also work trouble for Averell Harriman among "liberal" and left-wing groups in New York City. All reports indicate that Harriman is worried.

Nixon, too, is worried, say friends. If Rockefeller wins in New York in November, Nixon could conceivably face strong opposition in the GOP in 1960—New York being the key state in the convention line-up.

● But if Ike retires—admittedly a very speculative matter—and Nixon takes over, what then? No proof that Ike will retire has been pinned down, although the President did mention his "advancing years" in his press conference last week. Capital pundits wonder if the Democratic strategy of giving the President most of what he wants in legislation might well be aimed at providing him with a pleasant exit from office this fall. "A triumphant departure, work well done and finished." Could be.

Democratic leaders Johnson and Rayburn, who are giving Ike his legislation, might well foresee that Nixon then would have to carry the unhappy responsibility of a big GOP defeat in November. (If Nixon should take over, say, in September, it would be too late for his influence to be felt in the elections.) And he would have to fight a Democratic Congress for the two years thereafter. A bad preparation for a Nixon bid for renomination and election in 1960—that might well be the end result.

This strategy, according to some pundits, has been charted by such friends of Ike as General Lucius Clay and Cliff Roberts (both Democrats) and Paul Hoffman, GOP "liberal." These men are reportedly friendly with Anna Rosenberg, who in turn is friendly with Sidney Weinberg, former Democrat and recently a Modern Republican power behind the Ike Administration. Weinberg is Clay's boss in the Continental Can Company.

If everything clicked for them, the New York "liberal" internationalists would have it both ways come 1960: (1) in the Republican orbit, they would have Rockefeller on their team; (2) whoever the Democratic candidate might be, he would have to be "liberal" and internationalist so long as Walter Reuther holds the first mortgage on the Democratic party. Whether or not Ike retires this fall, the thesis stands up.

Hence, some of the boys who have to go to the Republican Convention in Albany, August 25, are pondering some of these considerations and wondering just how much Rockefeller is worth to them. A blitz for Nelson this month might enable the Democrats to blitz the GOP in 1960.

From Recession to Inflation: "Home fever" circulates restlessly through the congressional body as the end of the session approaches. Congressmen acutely want to get back to their districts to campaign for re-election, but their temperatures rise dramatically as they wonder how they can explain to the folks why certain things got through this session.

What things? Well, principally the spending orgy supposedly aimed at curing a recession which has suddenly changed its face and looms as a possibly uncontrollable inflation.

When Representative Wilbur Mills (D.-Ark.), Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and a moderate conservative, spoke solemnly last week to what correspondents described as a "hushed" House, he warned that the present level of spending unleashes "inflationary pressures" which may well result in "rises in prices such as we have not seen before in peacetime." And Representative Dan Reed (R.-N.Y.) likened the Na-

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. ● Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion's drift toward a runaway inflation to picnickers, adrift on the Niagara River, who ignored friendly warnings of "rapids ahead" and as a consequence were swept over the falls.

As the storm warnings reverberate, the "liberal" Democratic leadership of Sam Rayburn in the House and Lyndon Johnson in the Senate stands convicted—to use the phrase of many legislators—of "complete bankruptcy." Aided by the Modern Republicans, Johnson and Rayburn charted a legislative course of reckless spending and pushed through bills of incredible folly. Hence, as adjournment nears, "home fever" takes on some pathological aspects. "Liberal" Democrats and Modern Republicans obviously fear an electorate which (as Samuel Lubell's researches show—see news item in HUMAN EVENTS for July 7, 1958) opposes financial profligacy and wants an honest, stable dollar.

Those conservatives in both parties who have gallantly resisted the spendthrift course manifest none of the feverish symptoms of their "liberal" colleagues. The group led by Styles Bridges (R.-N.H.) and Harry Byrd (D.-Va.) in the Senate, and by Howard Smith (D.-Va.) and Richard Simpson (R.-Pa.) in the House, can face constituents with good records and clear consciences. This line-up in both houses suggests that the "old coalition" of Northern and Southern conservatives of both parties has come to life again. One of the most spectacular evidences of its vitality was the recent pigeonholing of the fantastic Community Facilities Bill, sponsored by "liberal" Democrats. (At a time when local bond issues find ready financing for all the city, county and state improvements ratified by the voters, the Community Facilities Bill backers wanted $2 billion in Federal loans to local governmental bodies.)

An effective liaison between Republicans, led by GOP whip Charles Halleck of Indiana and by Representative Edgar Hiestand of California, and Southern conservatives, led by Virginia's Representative Smith, was established. The result was a crushing defeat for the "facilities" bill on a decisive "rule" vote.

Further challenges will arise before the end of the session; on tap are such "boondoggles" as the TVA bill, the minerals subsidies, the housing bill (one of the most fantastic spending efforts of the entire session), and the depressed areas measure. In the cloakrooms, it is said that constituents can help extinguish such "inflation tinder" by writing their Congressmen, urging a halt to all pork-barrel spending.

Meanwhile, all members save out-and-out left-wingers await a ringing statement (which reportedly he is in a mood to make) from Secretary of the Treasury Robert Anderson, shifting the spotlight from recession to the peril of inflation. Anderson, it is remarked, could thus lift himself to the stature enjoyed by his predecessor, George Humphrey.

Knowland: The senior Senator from California sharply diminished some lingering doubts on Capitol Hill as to whether he could win the Governorship of his state by his hard-hitting speech in Sacramento last week. Knowland crashed down on his opponent, Attorney General Pat Brown, accusing him of heading an "imported Chicago machine-type political organization," and of planning to take over California with the labor bosses in "Michigan fashion." This obviously referred to Walter Reuther and his puppet Governor, "Soapy" Williams, in Michigan. This parallel—Reuther : Williams = Reuther : Pat Brown—has reportedly spread widely through the California electorate.

"Buster Brown," said Knowland, "and his imported Chicago machine-type political organization seek to impose a package deal on the historic Democratic party and on the people of this state. This is not good for California. He has 'busted' the historic Democratic party and has been the instrumentality by which CIO-COPE is gaining control over his party. Their ultimate hope is to take over this state, Michigan fashion."

Knowland also rebuffed GOP Governor Goodwin Knight (who seeks the favor of the labor bosses and who has been double-crossing Knowland) by getting the state central committee to reject a Knight-sponsored motion to approve the "union shop"—which Knowland, through his right-to-work platform, wants to ban. By his reiterated right-to-work stand, Knowland now assumes leadership of the party and draws behind him the growing rank-and-file support that is marshalling behind the right-to-work referendum.

Knowland further squared off against Brown by arraigning the Democratic candidate for failure to stem the rising tide of crime, and the influx of Eastern and Midwest crime syndicates. California's crime rate has increased 76 per cent and narcotics control has deteriorated in the last eight years, Knowland pointed out; and during that entire period, Brown, as Attorney General, has been the state's chief law-enforcement officer.

"These syndicates," warned Knowland, "are seeking to gain control of some of our labor organizations and by the investment of underworld funds to penetrate the economic structure of California." In Washington, where Federal direction of the war against narcotics is centered, there has circulated much talk of the growing power of the Mafia in the Sunset State, and the speculation that the Federal Government may have to take a hand in the situation before long.

Stassen Rides Again: Harold Stassen recently visited the White House and had a half-hour talk with the President. The phoenix arisen from the ashes of the primary defeat in Pennsylvania thereby served notice that he's still somebody in Washington, although he professed to be enveloped in law practice in Philadelphia.

According to insiders, however, the talk with the President appeared as less important than Stassen's very private and carefully concealed meetings with Under Secretary of State Christian Herter (Harold's choice to replace Nixon in the Vice Presidential fight in 1956). He also reportedly conferred with some key "middle-level" bureaucrats.

The forces which worked under Stassen when he was in Washington are now surfacing in the State Department. They favor appeasement of Khrushchev and Nasser, and advocate what is blandly referred to in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The New York Times as "economic redevelopment of the Mideast." Meanwhile, opposing elements in the State Department have been weakened and pushed aside.

For instance, there is the case of Assistant Secretary Loy Henderson. This veteran diplomat was the whipping boy of the Zionists in 1948, harassed by them and exiled for a time from the State Department because he sought a Mideast settlement consonant with the legitimate claims of the Arab countries. Today, while still advocating just treatment for the Arab countries, he opposes "Egyptian imperialism" controlled by Moscow, or "Nasserism," which US leftists have suddenly discovered and anointed as "Arab nationalism." Henderson, it is reported, has been shunted aside in top-level conferences in the Department since July 15.

The "spending" bureaucracy is in the ascendant, intent on making the Mideast "the greatest rathole in the world for American tax money." The bureaucrats, once pro-Zionist, cooled towards Israel as that country appeared as much the smaller receptacle into which they could pump "foreign aid." They rose in wrath when the Aswan Dam loan was cancelled and have been ardently pro-Nasser ever since—providing the most powerful allies the Egyptian dictator has enjoyed in the American forum in recent years. (The bureaucrats' sentiments provide a key to the wave of protests that appeared in the press, denouncing cancellation of the Aswan loan.) The approaching "Summit" may provide an opportunity for their biggest breakthrough.

In short: Stassen is gone, but "stassenism"—appeasement of Soviet Russia, appeasement of Soviet puppets (like Nasser) and bigger and better spending everywhere—remains and grows in influence.

Federal Aid to Education: Some revealing quotations concerning Federal aid to education were inserted in the *Congressional Record* recently by Representative Ralph Gwinn (R.-N.Y.). Among the pronouncements Gwinn assembled on the subject was one from Dwight D. Eisenhower (in 1949):

> **"I would flatly oppose any grant by the Federal Government to all states in the union for educational purposes. Such a policy would create an ambition—almost a requirement—to spend money freely under the impulse of competition with other localities in the country. It would completely destroy and defeat the watchful economy that comes about through local supervision over local expenditures of local revenues."**

Gwinn also quoted the Commission on Financing Higher Education, of the Association of American Universities (1952): "The strength of higher education is founded upon its freedom and upon the country's freedom . . . It is this freedom that must be protected if it becomes dependent upon any dominant support, no matter how beneficent or how enlightened that support may presently appear to be. Such independence will be threatened if higher education is subjected to further influence from the Federal Government . . . Direct Federal control would in the end produce uniformity, mediocrity, and compliance."

● Raymond Moley, commenting on the so-called "National Defense Education Act" in a recent column (released by The Associated Newspapers, 229 W. 43rd St., New York), noted that retiring Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Marion B. Folsom calls the act a system of "lures and baits in the form of matching fund grants" to induce states to spend more. It is a "ridiculous theory," Moley observed, "that when you give someone something, he will thereupon go out and buy the same. I wonder whether, as Folsom resumes his old job at Eastman Kodak, he will propose giving away cameras in order to get people to buy cameras. If so, I imagine that the board of directors would wonder whether six years in Washington had not impaired the judgment of their one-time treasurer."

Vermont Primary: A conservative vs. radical contest is going on in the Vermont Republican Senatorial primary, culminating in September. Lee Earl Emerson, a conservative who served as Governor from 1950 to 1954, fights it out with the state's one Congressman, W. L. Prouty, a radical Republican.

Emerson followed a safe-and-sane course during his term as Governor and left a substantial surplus in the State House till when he retired. (This contrasts with the substantial deficit which hangs over the state exchequer today.) Emerson enjoys a strong following among the conservative, native inhabitants who date their ancestry from the historic era of the Green Mountain Boys.

Prouty, the radical, is now serving his third term in the House. According to reports from Vermont, Prouty is known there as a Modern Republican. In the Nation's Capital, it is generally agreed that he is at least that. As a matter of fact, it is well known here that Prouty rates very high among the Members of Congress who have won the approval of the Americans for Democratic Action (ADA), the leftist pressure organization led by some of the most famous figures of the New and Fair Deals (see the article, "ADA: The Enemy Within," by M. Stanton Evans, in HUMAN EVENTS for June 30, 1958, for a description of how this group operates).

ADA analyzed the voting records of Members of Congress in the last session of Congress, and found approvingly that Prouty had voted the leftist ADA line on eight out of nine test issues. In Washington, observers wonder whether the voters of the famous old Green Mountain State stronghold of conservatism know these facts—and whether an invasion of "long-haired out-of-staters" has generated a "rising tide of liberalism" in that Republican bastion. It is a fact that many New Yorkers of the wealthy literary and artistic set have moved their homes to Vermont in recent years.

Some of the latter, advices say, are helping Prouty's campaign. Emerson, it is reported, enjoys no such "out-of-state" financial support and needs money.

Right to Work: The movement to secure passage of state right-to-work laws gathers steam as the opposing sides begin to marshal their forces for November voting. California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Ohio (pending final count on petition signatures) and Washington are scheduled to decide right-to-work proposals in November.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One state in which an attempt to put the proposal on the ballot was defeated this year was Montana, where the union bosses staged a last-minute high-pressure campaign, featuring newspaper ads containing forms by which people could withdraw their names from the petition. The proposal lost by 2000 votes.

(The largest union in Montana is the Communist-dominated Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers. In the Montana campaign against the right to work—commented the Communist Worker*—"the opposition to the referendum by the Farmers Union and the unaffiliated, progressive-led Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers proved decisive.")*

Outlook for the proposal in the remaining six states varies. One especially optimistic report comes from Colorado, where sentiment appears to be heavily in favor of voluntary unionism. "Labor leaders," comments *The New York Times*, "are worried at early polls by an independent research group. These polls indicated many union members and two-thirds of all women interviewed favored right to work, although apparently somewhat confused about its meaning. Under a court decision the words 'right to work' or 'freedom to work' cannot appear on the ballot."

In Washington, writes a well-known Seattle businessman, the right-to-work campaign at one time "bogged down for lack of funds—only enough cash to mail half the petitions . . . but with the deadline for filing signatures (3 July) less than four weeks away, union overconfidence resulted in rashness. The break came.

"One prominent business leader disregarded the consequences and publicly endorsed voluntary unionism . . . Others joined—whirlwind action—the vote assured with more than 25 per cent excess of signatures" (less than 91,000 signatures were required in Washington; 120,000 were obtained).

● The advance of right-to-work forces, as indicated above, has proved distressing to the mouthpiece of the Communist line, *The Worker*. Sounding the alarm that "anti-union forces" are "aiming for a jackpot" this November, the *Worker's* labor columnist, George Morris, comments that "the AFL-CIO is clearly worried. The editorial in this week's *AFL-CIO News* acknowledges that the 'right-to-workers' have met with a measure of success, 'and that labor has a man-size job on its hands come November' to defeat this effort to add six more states to the 18 already in the 'right-to-work' column."

Pork Barrel: Continuing exposures of wasteful spending in the field of public housing anger conservatives on Capitol Hill, as they wage a last-minute battle against the "Housing Act of 1958," passed by the Senate on July 11, and now before the House. Opponents of the legislation cite examples of "housing" waste and corruption:

● Existing law states that families placed in public housing projects should be drawn from the lowest income groups. Yet it was recently disclosed that a moderate-sized family, under the present administration of the law, can earn up to $9800 gross annual income and legally remain in a public housing project!

● Even more tellingly, economy advocates ask: why authorize additional units of public housing when so many completed projects are presently under-subscribed? In Denver, it is pointed out, public housing units averaged 8.3 per cent vacancies in 1956. When questioned about these vacancies, Public Housing officials blandly announced that—in the midst of the so-called housing "crisis"—they are "stockpiling" public housing units.

"Every effort is being made to reduce this vacancy . . ." says the Authority's Executive Director. "There are presently over 7,000 slum dwelling units in Denver which are beyond repair and should be demolished. Is it not also reasonable," he continued, "to stockpile a reasonable number of dwelling units the same as other crucial defense materials are stockpiled?"

ACA: A "conservative ADA" was the term used by HUMAN EVENTS, way back in October, 1953, to describe a meeting of right wingers held that month in Omaha, Nebraska. The concept of a conservative counterpart of the left-wing ADA (Americans for Democratic Action), meanwhile, has grown, and last week it blossomed in the unveiling of the ACA—Americans for Constitutional Action. The new organization is headed by Admiral Ben Moreell, soon-to-retire Chairman of the Board of Jones and Laughlin Steel Company. Trustees include former Governor Charles Edison, Henning W. Prentis, Chairman of the Board of Armstrong Cork Company, former Congressman Ed Gossett of Texas and Dr. Walter D. Martin of Virginia, former President of the American Medical Association.

The principal purpose of the ACA will be to "support regardless of partisan considerations" the causes and candidates conforming to objectives "which are essential to the preservation of the opportunity state created and preserved by our Republic." The first announcement affirms support for free enterprise, private ownership, sound money, sound fiscal policy and states' rights, and makes clear that its intention is to launch a political action movement among conservatives in the country. (For information, write to ACA, c/o Admiral Moreell, 3 Gateway Center, Pittsburgh 22, Pa.)

ALBERT G. SIMMS, former Member of Congress (New Mexico): "HUMAN EVENTS is a justly critical description of what is going on in Washington."

Additional copies of 4-page News Section or Article Section: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1000 copies $30. In lots of 5000 $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, and 1957 volumes available.

For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* — JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
M. STANTON EVANS, *Managing Editor* — FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second-class matter, Washington, D. C. Copyright 1958.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XV, No. 32 HUMAN EVENTS August 11, 1958
Article Section *Printed in Two Sections*

The resounding renomination victory of Governor Orval Faubus of Arkansas has served notice on Northern Democrats that Southern feeling on the question of Federally enforced "integration" is deeper than had hitherto been believed. Such increasingly militant Southern resistance to "liberal" dictated policies of the national Democratic party points to an unusual opportunity for conservative forces to wrest victory out of the next Presidential election. The following article describes the circumstances that make such a development possible.

A SOUTHERN PRESIDENT?
The South May Very Well Rise Again

By JOHN J. SYNON

IF YOU ARE of a mind to place a bob or two on a solid long-shot, you could do worse than tab a Southerner as the next President of the United States. (Some names to conjure with: Thurmond, McClellan, Eastland and the two Georgia Senators, Russell and Talmadge.) For there is a strange concoction boiling in our Nation's political cauldron and before it is placed before us for consumption, in January, 1961, a number of erratic developments may occur.

As might be supposed, their genesis lies in the desegregation decision of the Warren Court. This opinion threw down the one gauntlet Southerners cannot accept—not now, not in 1960, and not in the year of our Lord 2000. Therefore, they mean to reverse it. Since neither the courts nor a jaundiced Congress are apt to ease their pain, Southern leaders, if they can, mean to use the next Presidential election as their medium for relief and the Electoral College as their specific device. They mean to elect one of their own.

Actually, the move to put a Southerner in the White House has already begun and if the sparks struck in Georgia and Alabama catch fire, encompass the phalanx of eleven states that form the South, the possibility Southerners have perceived will become a probability.

In recent months these two states have acted to make themselves independent of the national Democratic party. Georgia has amended its election laws so that its Presidential Electors will not be bound to vote for any pre-ordained person, particularly not for the nominee of the Democratic party. Georgians have reverted instead to the idea the Founding Fathers held when they devised the Electoral College, providing for the indirect election of the President.

In Alabama, voters have installed a majority in the Democratic Executive Committee which is opposed to the so-called "Loyalty Oath" formerly imposed on Democratic candidates in that state. This action signifies a readiness on the part of Alabamans to bolt the national ticket in 1960, as they did in 1948. Throughout the South, political leaders are figuring in terms of moves that will free them from the national party in the 1960 Electoral College.

WHEN THE United States was founded, it was believed that the way to insure that our Nation would obtain the services of the

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

best-qualified man as President was to elect, by popular vote, a "college" of wise men from whose deliberation the choice of President would be made. However noble this original concept, it was soon lost. For with the rise of our political parties and the subsequent birth of political conventions, the wise-men idea went a-glimmering and the party's choice was all that mattered. And so it has been ever since.

It was this actuality, that of being locked to the national party's choice, that scuttled the South's one previous effort at rising as a third force. In 1948, it will be recalled, the South had become so sickened of the New Deal and its socialist doctrines, it ran Strom Thurmond, then Governor of South Carolina, as its candidate for President. Thurmond was labelled a "Dixiecrat," and while he polled more than a million votes and while 39 electoral ballots were cast in his favor, his effort, while gallant, was stillborn; for the bulk of Southerners are "Democrats" as they are Southerners—emotionally. Being anything else is being something less than respectable. So, in 1948, while Southerners generally despised Harry Truman with even greater virulence than did his most partisan Republican enemies, Southerners elected Truman and Strom Thurmond, Dixiecrat, went into limbo.

That taught the Mason-Dixon politicians all they needed to know about a splinter party. As a consequence, since 1948 they have had their heads together in an effort to find a way out of the dilemma that sees their conservative body politic in bed with the "liberals" of the North.

NOW, IT'S SAID that if you put enough Southern political heads together, soon or late, the result will be one great snore. Be that as it may, no one has ever denied the political sagacity of these same Southern heads. And had they been left to their own languorous devices, they may very well have rocked off to Never-Never land and things would have gone on much as they had in the past. But Earl Warren, in May, 1954, gave them an electric jolt that makes it unlikely that they'll ever go to sleep again.

So, they are moving. Georgia has acted legally, Alabama politically, to make it possible for their Electors, once the College meets, to vote for any one they choose and the regular Democratic nominee, whatever Yankee he may be, can go shout up a rope. What's more, they don't have to campaign a candidate. They can just wait until the College meets, then name their man.

If the other states which comprise the South take the hook baited by Georgia and Alabama, they will have a bloc—depending on variations within the individual states — of at least 100 Electoral votes, done tidily in a package all their very own. There are 531 such votes in total, 266 being the majority needed to elect. This means, if, in 1960, the Republicans garner less than a majority but more than 166 and the Southerners withhold their approximately 100 votes, the Northern Democrats, as the others, will be without a majority. That the Republicans will score within this range, oddly enough, is the political probability.

Such being the case, with each of the three factions voting for its choice but with none having a majority of Electoral votes, the election will be thrown into the House of Representatives — just where the Southern leaders dream of getting it. For that is what the Twelfth Amendment to the Constitution says is to be done. If the Electoral College produces no clear majority, "the House of Representatives shall choose immediately" the President.

Moreover, unlike the "College," which has proportionate representation, the House vote "shall be taken by states, the representation from each state having one vote." In electing a President, however, the House does not have the same freedom of choice as the Electoral College, which, theoretically, could elect any "na-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tural-born citizen" possessing certain qualifications. The House must choose "from the persons having the highest number [of Electoral votes] not exceeding three."

Said another way, the House, given the opportunity, may elect any one of the three people that the Electoral College places first, second and third in its balloting. But only from these and none other. Under such circumstances, the South would hold the balance of power. And this is the end to'rd which many of its leaders are working, or at least thinking.

For, as the Constitution says, the House would have but 48 votes, ten or eleven of which, constituting the Southern bloc, could stand aside and await the certain courtship of the others. As in the "College," so in the House: a majority is needed to elect, and for either major party to get 25 votes without the South's help, in today's political climate, is a near impossibility. The split would then be about 25 to 12, with one major party beating the other by better than two-to-one. Neither party is that strong.

Consider for a moment the party domination of our Congressional delegations, since they would vote as a unit. While it is true that the Republicans now have a majority representation on 21 of the 48, as against the Northern Democrats' 11, the chances are that this will change, come election time this fall and in the fall of 1960, and not in favor of the Republicans. (It will be essential for conservative Congressmen to be elected in Northern and Western states in 1960, because the Presidency will be decided, under this hypothesis, by the incoming Congress of January, 1961.)

There are a number of delegations, five by count, that are evenly split. While it is conceivable that they would go *en bloc* one way or the other, even then neither of the major parties could expect to muster the needed 25 votes. The advent of Alaska as a state will make little difference — 25 votes will still be needed.

Unless the Republicans sweep in 1960, the election of the President probably will be decided by Southern Congressmen. The question, therefore, is which of the other groups would the South join to make the needed majority and why would it choose to go that way rather than the other? That question is more rhetorical than not; for a quarter of a century has passed since there was force in the issues that once made the Republicans "Republican" and the Democrats "Democratic." Only the meaningless names remain. What we have, in actuality, are "liberal" and "conservative" leanings. These are the realities.

WHEREAS THE Southerner, as an individual, may cast a "Grandpappy" vote, voting Democratic come hell or high water, his Representatives in Congress are under no delusion as to what is best for their section of the country. Spiritually, the Southern Congressman and his constituent are of a mold; they are conservative and more nearly in alignment with the Republican party than with the Northern Democrats, whose patron saint is Walter Reuther. If this were not so, if the South were not determined to divorce this Northern partner, there would be no point in working, as they are, to have the election thrown into the House. It is well to understand, though, that in divorcing her incompatible spouse, Miss Magnolia Blossom has no mind to become the concubine of the other. For, however the GOP may wring its hands in denying Earl Warren, he is (or was) registered as a Republican and Magnolia knows him as one of them.

If the House actually gets the Presidency in its hot hands it will give the Nation a political show such as it has not seen in more than a century. The horse trade of the age will be under way and the "to boot" will be the Vice Presidency. The Senate handles that.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Such Senate deliberations, however, are even more severely restricted than those of the House. It can consider but the top two in Electoral votes. This, probably, would foreclose the South's Vice Presidential candidate from consideration. So, it must hang tough on the Presidency or get nothing. And it's not apt to settle for nothing. Knowing this, the other two parties will shoot for the second spot as consolation prize. The South will choose one of its two suitors, and the fun will be done.

What the ramifications of this will be, if it comes about, are breathtaking. Besides electing a President, it almost certainly would bring revolutionary changes within the parties, themselves, and for the first time in a generation allow coalescence of conservative strength. With that may come the emergence of an administration more nearly reflective of the Nation's true political colors.

CAN IT be done? Well, it's been done twice before. On two occasions the House has named our President. The first time, following the election of 1800, was when Aaron Burr tried a large-sized shenanigan on Thomas Jefferson; the second was in 1824, when Jackson was pitted against J. Q. Adams. It's been done, all right.

The success or failure of the present effort will turn on two factors and the politicians who have dreamed up the maneuver know it. If the Republicans, for instance, should sweep in 1960, you can forget it. But as of this reading, the possibility of that happening is remote indeed. It is the Democrats who are surging, not the GOP, and this enhances the chance of Southerners—so long as the Democrats don't overdo it.

The South is praying, therefore, that the Republicans do not muster enough strength to win on their own, or find themselves so routed as to fail to get at least 166 Electoral votes. If the latter were to happen, the Northern Democrats, of course, could win on *their* own.

However, if one were put to an estimate, this area, between 166 and 266, seems to be about where the Republicans are likely to fall. For with all the political winds but one—the farm vote — blowing against the GOP, this seems their fate. In any event, there isn't much the South can do about that—it's in the laps of the political gods. So, they pray.

The other element involved, that of amending the election laws of the South, is subject to effort, however, and these dedicated people may be expected to work like beavers to achieve their end. As the fruits to be had, through victory, become apparent to the rank-and-file Southerner you may look for a speed up in their states' legislative processes. They will be prodded into following Georgia and Alabama, though precious little prodding will be needed. Once awake, Johnny Reb will rustle every shred of crinoline left in Atlanta and every gray rag in the South will be hung in the breeze with loving care, for "The Cause" will have called again. And that ain't easy to beat. Ask the original Sherman.

John J. Synon, a former newspaperman born and raised in Virginia, is now a California Industrial Accident Commissioner. His most recent contribution to HUMAN EVENTS was "Knowland At The Crossroads," June 16, 1958.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $11 per year.
TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "A SOUTHERN PRESIDENT?" at $_____.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately—at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED